REMARKS

By the present response, Applicant has amended claims 2, 4, 11, 12 and 19 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-5, 7, 9-13, 16 and 18-25 remain pending in the present application.

In the Office Action dated October 7, 2005, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 7, 9-13, 16 and 18-25 under U.S.C. 35 §103(a) as being unpatentable over a U.S. Patent No. 6463144 (Dunn et al) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5692033 (Farris).

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-13, 16 and 18-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn et al in view of Farris. Applicant has discussed the deficiencies of these references in Applicant's previously filed response, and reasserts all arguments submitted in that response. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and provides the following additional remarks.

Regarding claims 1, 10 and 18, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, *inter alia*, storing a calling party number of an origination subscriber if the termination subscriber has registered for the calling party number call-back service, where the storing the calling party number includes comparing an area code of the calling party number with the area code of termination subscriber, and storing the calling party

number exclusive of the area code if the two area codes are identical to each other, and storing both the area code and the corresponding calling party number if the two area codes are different from each other.

The Examiner admits that Dunn et al does not disclose or suggest these limitations but asserts that Farris discloses these limitations in column 13, line 50 through column 14, line 4. However, these portions of Farris merely disclose that the use of off-hook trigger minimizes the number of outgoing calls from the subscriber station until the callers in the queue have been serviced and that dialed digits by the caller are collected to determine whether they correspond to a stored password that allows outgoing calls during the queue interval, and if there is a match, the destination digits are collected and the outgoing call completion proceeds, and if there is no match, the outgoing call is routed to an announcement that the outgoing service is temporarily blocked. These portions of Farris merely relate to the use of a password that allows outgoing calls. This is not comparing an area code of the calling party number with an area code of the termination subscriber, as recited in the claims of the present application. These portions of Farris relate only to the calling party and whether the outgoing calls from the calling party are being permitted. These portions do not disclose or suggest anything related to the area code of a termination subscriber, or comparing an area code of the calling party number with an area code of the termination subscriber. Further, Farris does not disclose or suggest anything related to storing the calling party number exclusive of the area code if the two area codes are identical to

each other, and storing <u>both the area code and corresponding calling party number if the two area codes are different from each other</u>, as recited in the claims of the present application. Area codes are neither disclosed nor suggested in Farris.

Regarding claims 2-5, 7, 9, 11-13, 16 and 19-25, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 10 and 18 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims. For example, Applicant submits that none of the cited references disclose or suggest where identifying a calling party number includes requesting the calling party number from the origination processing unit if the requested call is an intra-office call, checking whether a switching system of an intra-office is a single station when the calling party number is informed, and storing the calling party number informed by the origination processing unit in a database if the switching system of an intra-office is a single station.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1-5, 7, 9-13, 16 and 18-25 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-5, 7, 9-13, 16 and 18-25 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP

David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694
Fredrick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DCO/FDB:cah:tlg
Date: January 6, 2006

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610